

Sinclair
Broadcasting uses
public airwaves that
belong to We The
People. Sinclair has
a responsibility to
serve the public
interest. How can
the public interest
be served by airing
a partisan attack
movie smearing a
candidate who just
happens to be
running for this
nation's highest
office, and doing it
one week before the
presidential
election.

Sinclair
Broadcasting can try
to "spin" their
highly partisan
decision as airing
"news", however, the
American Heritage
dictionary defines
"news" as,
"information about
recent events."
Airing a
"documentary" about
one soldier's
opinion of what
another soldier did
after the Viet Nam
war over thirty
years ago is not
"news" by any
stretch of the
imagination.

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to force
their stations to
air an anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the

public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.